| 1<br>2<br>3<br>4<br>5 | MARIO N. ALIOTO, ESQ. (56433) LAUREN C. CAPURRO, ESQ. (241151) TRUMP, ALIOTO, TRUMP & PRESCOTT, LLP 2001 Union Street, Suite 482 San Francisco, CA 94123 Telephone: (415) 563-7200 Facsimile: (415) 346-0679 E-mail: malioto@tatp.com laurenrussell@tatp.com |  |
|-----------------------|--|--|
| 6                     | Lead Counsel for the Indirect-Purchaser Plaintiffs   |  |
| 7                     |  |  |
| 8                     |  |  |
| 9                     |  |  |
| 10                    | UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT   |  |
| 11                    | NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  |  |
| 12                    | OAKLAND DIVISION   |  |
| 13                    |  |  |
| 14                    | IN RE CATHODE RAY TUBE (CRT)<br>ANTITRUST LITIGATION   | ) Master File No. 4:07-cv-5944-JST   |
| 15                    |  | MDL No. 1917    PROPOSED] ORDER REGARDING   INDIRECT PURCHASER PLAINTIFFS' |
| 16                    | This Document Relates to:  |  |
| 17                    | Indirect-Purchaser Class Action  |  |
| 18                    |  | <ul><li>NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION</li><li>IN LIMINE NO. 11:</li></ul>    |
| 19                    |  | ) ) TO EXCLUDE EVIDENCE AND  |
| 20                    |  | ) ARGUMENT PORTRAYING THE IRICO DEFENDANTS' PARTICIPATION IN               |
| 21                    |  | THE CONSPIRACY OR ACTS COMMITTED PURSUANT THERETO                          |
| 22                    |  | AS COMPELLED BY THE CHINESE  |
| 23                    |  | ) GOVERNMENT OR CHINESE LAW  |
| 24                    |  | )  |
| 25                    |  |  |
| 26                    |  |  |
| 27                    |  |  |
| 28                    |  |  |

## [PROPOSED] ORDER 1 2 3 Upon consideration of Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs' ("Plaintiffs") Motion in Limine No. 11 4 to exclude evidence and argument portraying the Irico Defendants' participation in the conspiracy 5 or acts committed pursuant thereto as compelled by the Chinese government or Chinese law, it is hereby 6 7 ORDERED that the motion is GRANTED, and at trial, the Irico Defendants ("Irico") shall 8 not offer evidence or argument in support of any of the following propositions: 9 1. The Chinese government or Chinese law dictated the prices Irico was obligated to charge for CRTs; 10 11 2. Irico sold CRTs at prices mandated by the Chinese government or Chinese law; or 12 3. The Chinese government or Chinese law imposed duties on Irico that were 13 inconsistent with, or prevented them from complying with, U.S. law. 14 15 16 17 Dated: 18 19 20 The Honorable Jon S. Tigar United States District Judge 21 Northern District of California 22 23 24 25 26 27 28